



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/775,765	02/10/2004	Frederick P. Herrmann	0717.2041-001	8724

21005 7590 06/14/2007  
HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.  
530 VIRGINIA ROAD  
P.O. BOX 9133  
CONCORD, MA 01742-9133

EXAMINER
----------

FATAHI YAR, MAHMOUD

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2629

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

06/14/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/775,765

Applicant(s)

HERRMANN, FREDERICK P.

Examiner

Mike Fatahiyar

Art Unit

2629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 September 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>6/28/04 and 9/20/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Edwards et al(2002/0054005A1).

Edwards et al disclose a method driving a liquid crystal display device comprising a data bus(26, 27), a row buffer(21, 25) and a switch network(31A, 31B, 31C) coupled to the row buffer which are function as claimed.

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 2-8 and 11-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Edwards et al in view of Janssen et al(2002/0135557A1).

Edwards et al is discussed above. Janssen et al is cited to show that the concept of connecting a switching device(74) to adjacent respective pair of column lines(80A, 80B) of an LCD(figure 3) and wherein a first column of the pair of column lines is coupled to alternating pixels of the first column-line is old. Thus, it would have been

Art Unit: 2629

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the LCD system of Edwards et al with the above noted teachings of Janssen et al such that a switching device would be coupled to an adjacent respective pair of column lines of the LCD and wherein the first column of the pair of column lines is coupled to alternating pixels of the first column because both references are directed to column driving of an LCD display device with digital video signals and reduction of column capacitances.

In claims 3-6 and 12-15, as to the limitations "at least three MOSFETs of n-channels or p-channels or a combination of n-channel and p-channel are also shown to old by Edwards et al(see [0024] and [0025]).

In claims 8 and 17, as to the limitation "the pixels are arranged in a rectangular layout for a black and white display, such is also true in the system of Edwards et al(see figure 1).

5. Claims 9 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Edwards et al and Janssen et al as applied to claims 7 and 16 above, and further in view of Hashimoto(5,619,225).

Edwards et al and Janssen et al are discussed above. Hashimoto is cited to show the concept of utilizing a delta layout pixels arrangement is old(see figures 5 and 10). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the noted teachings of Hashimoto to the modified system of a Edwards et al in order to provide a delta layout pixels arrangement because it desirable to drive a color LCD panel and further because the delta layout pixels arrangement is a conventional layout arrangement for color LCD panels.


6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Ayres et al and Stroomer are made of record to show various types of LCD panels having delta layout pixels arrangement and/or driving of an LCD panel without utilizing DACs and amplifiers.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mike Fatahiyar whose telephone number is (571)272-7688. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:30 to 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Hjerpe, can be reached on 571-272-7691. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

*MF*  
M. Fatahiyar  
June 9 2007

  
RICHARD HJERPE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600